

Appl. No. 10/020,390
Amdt. dated December 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

Atty. Ref. 81800.0169
Customer No. 26021

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 7 and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 7. In FIG. 7, the legend --Prior Art-- is added.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-20 were presented. Claims 1, 10 and 16-18 are amended, and claims 21-23 are added. Claims 1-23 are now pending.

Drawings

The Action objects to the drawings under MPEP 608.02(g) and asserts that Fig. 7 should be designated as "Prior Art". In response, FIG. 7 is amended to include the legend "Prior Art".

Claim Objections

The spelling errors noted in claims 17 and 18 are corrected as suggested in the Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Naylor (US 6,625,642) in view of Staples (US 6,301,339). Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17 and 18 are rejected as obvious over Naylor in view of Staples and Ho (US 5,805,298). Claims 4 and 19 are rejected as obvious over Naylor in view of Staples and applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected as obvious over Naylor, Staples and Ho in view of AAPA. Claim 12 is rejected as obvious over Naylor in view of Staples and Antognini (US 2004/0218226 A1).

In response, independent claims 1, 10 and 16 are amended to clearly distinguish over the cited references. In particular, claims 1 and 10 are amended as follows:

"...means for determining which network is to be used based on identifying information including a first identifier for the private branch network, a second identifier for the public switched telephone network, and a third identifier for the computer communication network..."

Claim 16 is amended as follows:

"...determining which network of the private exchanging network, a public switched telephone network, and a computer communication network is to be used based on identifying information including a first identifier for the private branch network, a second identifier for the public switched telephone network, and a third identifier for the computer communication network..."

Thus claims 1, 10 and 16 each require that the determination of which network is used is based on a first identifier for a private branch network, a second identifier for a public switched network, and a third identifier for a computer communication network. None of the cited reference disclose or suggest such a feature.

Naylor, the primary reference, col. 2, lines 64-65, teaches a destination identifier that takes the form of a phone number, an email address, or both (col. 2, lns. 64-65). This does not correspond to the use of three different identifiers for different networks as claimed in claims 1, 10 and 16. Moreover, Naylor fails to disclose or suggest how to identify a private branch network.

Staples does not remedy the deficiencies of Naylor. In col. 7, lines 28-30, Staples merely suggests the use of a private branch exchange (PBX) but fails to disclose or suggest the use of identifying information to determine which network to use or how to identify a private branch network.

Ho does not remedy the deficiencies of Naylor and Staples. In col. 6, lines 58-61, Ho discloses parsing a destination identifier for an "@" symbol to identify an email transmission but fails to disclose or suggest how to identify a private branch network with a destination identifier, as required by applicant's claims.

Antognini does not remedy the deficiencies of Naylor, Staples, or Ho. In paragraph [0014], Antognini discloses broadcasting a fax to ordinary fax phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and IP addresses but fails to disclose or suggest a

Appl. No. 10/020,390
Amdt. dated December 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

Atty. Ref. 81800.0169
Customer No. 26021

means to determine which network to use based on an identifier for a private branch network.

Since Naylor, Staples, Ho and Antognini do not disclose or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 10 and 16, as amended, the rejections of those claims and claims dependent thereon under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 21-23 are added to further define the three claimed network identifiers.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in form for allowance. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 5, 2005

By:

Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701



FIG. 7

